U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2012-0028-EA September 7, 2012

BSEM White River Oil Well Project

Lease No. NVN 86657 BSEM Federal # 1-35

And

Lease No. NVN 86605 BSEM Federal # 1-14

White River Valley Nye County, Nevada

Applicant/Address:
Bright Sky Energy & Minerals, Inc.
17501 Rimrock Drive
Golden, Colorado 80401

Ely District Office Ely, Nevada Phone: 775-289-1800 Fax: 775-289-1910



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT EGAN FIELD OFFICE

INTRODUCTION

I have reviewed Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2012-0028-EA, for the Bright Sky Energy & Minerals, Inc.'s BSEM Federal wildcat oil wells project, dated September 6, 2012, taking into consideration the project design specifications, including minimization or mitigation measures identified in the EA:

- Best Management Practices (BMP) outlines in the BLM oil and gas Gold Book
- BLM 9113 Manual regarding standards in road design, construction, and maintenance
- Onshore Orders Regulations
- Conditions of Approval (COA)
- Drilling Program and Surface Use Plan of Operations

I have also considered the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to the context and the intensity of impacts described in the EA:

Context:

The proposed action would occur within White River Valley, located in northeastern Nye County, Nevada. The project is site-specific actions directly involving approximately eighteen acres of BLM administered land that by itself does not have international, national, regional, or statewide importance. Implementation of the proposed action will allow Bright Sky Energy & Minerals, Inc. to exercise its rights under the lease agreement to explore for reserves of oil and gas, so as to meet the increasing energy needs of this Nation. Any impacts resulting from the proposed action will be minimized through the carefully planned proposed action developed in the APD, the standard State and Federal operating regulations for oil and gas exploration, and the conditions of approval.

Intensity:

1) *Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse:*

The environmental assessment has considered both beneficial and adverse impacts of the oil and gas exploration project. Overall, the project will provide some economic benefits to the local communities and perhaps the development of additional oil and gas reserves. Successful reclamation efforts will re-establish native vegetation to approximately eighteen acres of disturbance. Adverse effects will consist of further disrupting these eighteen acres of existing sagebrush and saline meadow communities, and increasing their susceptibility for weed invasion.

2) <u>The degree to which the Proposed Action affects public health or safety:</u> Implementation components of the proposed action will not result in potentially substantial or adverse impacts to public health and safety.

3) <u>Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historical or cultural resources, parks lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas:</u>

There are no unique environmental characteristics that would be disturbed in the geographic area. Today this portion of White River Valley is used primarily for grazing, hunting, and agriculture. By implementation of BMPs and COAs, minimal impact should occur.

4) The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial:

The methods chosen to implement the drilling project and complete reclamation are accepted methods to meet resource and management objectives and are not considered highly controversial.

5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks:

There are no effects of the proposed action identified in the EA that are considered uncertain or involve unknown risks. All reclamation actions proposed to be employed have been developed through the drilling of over 200 oil and gas wells in the Ely BLM District and are accepted standard practices.

- 6) The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration:

 The proposed action does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects and does not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.
- 7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant impacts:

No significant cumulative impacts have been identified in the EA. The number of wells drilled in the Ely District is far less than that estimated in the Ely District Approved Resource Management Plan (August 2008)

8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources:

There are no known significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources in the area; therefore, the proposed action will not cause the loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources.

9) The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973:

A field survey for this EA determined that no endangered or threatened species or their habitats are present in the project area.

10) Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment:

The proposed action will not violate or threaten to violate any Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

I have determined that, with incorporation of the design features, the proposed action will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and that preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

Timothy R. Shannon

Field Manager Egan Field Office Date